



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,986	03/30/2001	Carl M. Ellison	42390P8096	8962

8791 7590 03/14/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/822,986

Applicant(s)

ELLISON ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Pyzocha

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01212005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2137

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-15 and 17-21 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 01/21/2005 has been received and considered.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The noted missing documents have been considered on 03/04/2005.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The rejections of claims 11-12 by 35 USC 112 have been withdrawn based on the amendments.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 13-15, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waldin et al (U.S. 6,094,731) and

Art Unit: 2137

further in view of Menezes et al ("Handbook of Applied Cryptography").

As per claims 13 and 19, the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system discloses a method and program comprising: determining whether a digital signature chain accompanies a file to be accessed (see Waldin et al column 7 lines 22-28 where it is inherent that if the recipient and originating computer are the same it must determine if the file has a digital signature chain); entering into isolated execution mode if the file does not have a corresponding digital signature chain; analyzing an integrity of the file; and issuing the digital signature chain if the file has an acceptable file integrity (see Waldin et al column 6 lines 18-65) and verifying the digital signature chain of the file by determining whether the file has an acceptable file integrity, and whether each signatory providing the digital signature chain is authorized (see column 6 lines 18-65).

Waldin et al fails to disclose the digital signature chain (Waldin et al discloses a hash chain).

However, Menezes et al teaches a digital signature from a hash (see page 452-454).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Menezes et al's

Art Unit: 2137

method of digital signature creation for the hash chain of Waldin et al's system.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for authentication, authorization and non-repudiation of information (see Menezes et al page 22).

As per claims 14 and 20, the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system discloses precluding access to the file if the file has unacceptable file integrity (see Waldin et al column 6 lines 18-65).

As per claims 15 and 21, the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system discloses precluding access to the file if at least one signatory of the digital signature chain is unauthorized (see Waldin et al column 6 lines 18-65).

As per claim 18, the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system discloses opening the file if the verified digital signature chain indicates acceptable file integrity (see Waldin et al column 6 lines 18-65); and refusing to open the if the verified digital signature chain indicates unacceptable file integrity (see Waldin et al column 4 lines 45-62).

7. Claims 1-5, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system and further in view of Garney (US 5386552).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 1, the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al disclose a platform comprising: a processor (see figure 1 #9); and a memory coupled to the processor, the memory including an isolated memory area containing a file checker executable by the processor, the file checker including a file analyzer to perform a scan operation on a file to produce a scanning result and a signature generator to produce a signature chain including a digital signature having the scanning result (see column 4 lines 45-62).

The modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system fails to disclose being a portion of the memory accessible by the processor only when the processor is operating in an isolated execution mode.

However, Garney teaches the use of isolated memory (see column 2 lines 64-68 and column 3 lines 46-52).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Garney's isolated memory to store file checker and signature generator of the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system.

Motivation to do so would have been all the system to handle interrupts from different devices (see Garney column 3 lines 35-45).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 2, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system disclose the scan operation by the file checker is a virus detection function (see Waldin et al column 4 lines 48-49).

As per claim 3, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system disclose the incoming file is prevented from being executed if the verified digital signature chain indicated an unacceptable file integrity (see Waldin et al column 6 lines 18-65).

As per claim 4, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system disclose the incoming file is accessed if the verified digital signature chain indicates acceptable file integrity (see Waldin et al column 6 lines 18-65).

As per claim 5, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system disclose a first control unit coupled to both the processor and the memory (see Waldin et al column 4 lines 45-62).

As per claim 9, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system disclose the file analyzer is a virus detector, an intrusion detector, or a file integrity checker (see column 4 lines 48-49).

As per claim 10, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system discloses the signature generator comprises an

Art Unit: 2137

encryptor to encrypt the scanning result using a signature key (see Menezes et al pages 452-454); and a time stamper coupled to the encryptor to timestamp the encrypted result using a time indicator, the time stamped encrypted result corresponds to the digital signature (see Waldin et al column 4 line 63 through column 5 line 50).

As per claim 11, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system discloses the time indicator is one of a calendar time and a version identifier of the scanner (see Waldin et al column 4 lines 63-67).

As per claim 12, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system discloses the file is code (see Waldin et al column 3 lines 5-20).

8. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Swaney et al (U.S. 4,488,232).

As per claim 6, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al and Garney system fails to disclose a second control unit coupled to the first control unit and a token bus interface.

However Swaney et al teaches a token bus interface (see column 8 lines 9-27 where it is inherent the system with a token bus interface must have a second control unit coupled with the

Art Unit: 2137

first control unit to allow for the output of the file via the token bus interface).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Swaney et al's token bus interface within the modified system of Waldin et al and Menezes et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for the systems to use a token bus to transfer the data (see Swaney et al column 1 lines 10-14).

As per claim 7, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al, and Swaney et al system discloses non-volatile memory coupled to the second control unit (see Swaney et al column 5 lines 1-13).

As per claim 8, the modified Waldin et al, Menezes et al, and Swaney et al system discloses input/output devices coupled to the second control unit (see column 8 lines 9-27).

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Hewlett-Packard Co. (EP 1030237).

As per claim 17, the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system fails to disclose issuing the digital signature chain with an indication that the file integrity is unacceptable if

Art Unit: 2137

the integrity of the file is analyzed and determined to be unacceptable.

However, Hewlett-Packard Co. discloses such an indication (see column 6 lines 33-36).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Hewlett-Packard Co.'s indication in the modified Waldin et al and Menezes et al system.

Motivation to do so would have been to determine when a file is being access (see Hewlett-Packard Co column 7 lines 1-8).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. Applicant's arguments filed 01/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues: in claim 13 Waldin fails to disclose an isolated execution mode if the file does not have a corresponding digital signature chain; analyzing an integrity of the files and issuing the digital signature if the file has an acceptable file integrity, and a similar argument directed to claim 19.

Art Unit: 2137

Regarding Applicant's argument that Waldin fails to disclose an isolated execution mode if the file does not have a corresponding digital signature chain; analyzing an integrity of the files and issuing the digital signature if the file has an acceptable file integrity, Applicant is directed to the cited portions of Waldin particularly column 6 lines 43-48 Waldin discloses entering a scanning process when a part of the chain fails, and issuing the digital signature if the file has acceptable integrity (see also figure 4 numbers 46-49). Claim 19 has similarly argued limitations.

#### **Conclusion**

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2137

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rohatgi (US 6826687) discloses a digital signature chain and Dresevic et al (US 6253374) discloses checking a digital signature before executing software.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Andrew Caldwell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Andrew" and last name "Caldwell" clearly distinguishable.

**ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**